



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,392	09/05/2003	Trebor Heminway	MKPA-107US	9588
23122	7590	12/21/2006	EXAMINER	
RATNERPRESTIA			JOHNSON, JONATHAN J	
P O BOX 980			ART UNIT	
VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482-0980			PAPER NUMBER	
			1725	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	12/21/2006	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

5.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/656,392	Applicant(s) HEMINWAY ET AL.	
	Examiner Jonathan Johnson	Art Unit 1725	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2006.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.

7) ☒ Claim(s) 3 is/are objected to.

8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Boisgontier et al. (4,984,866). Boisgontier et al. teaches a solder preform for attaching an optical fiber having a diameter to a fiber attach pad, the solder preform comprising a body including solder at least on a bottom surface thereof, the body having a groove extending along a first face from a first end to a second, the groove being larger in size than the optical fiber to allow alignment of the optical fiber within the groove such that the solder perform is configured to permit alignment of the optical fiber in first and second directions when groove of the solder perform is placed over the optical fiber (column 12, lines 16-21 and Figures); the body having a length defined as a distance between the first end and the second end a height defined as a distance between the bottom surface and the top surface opposite the bottom surface and a width defined as a distance between the third end and a fourth end opposite the third surface (col. 12, ll. 16-41); the height of the groove is larger than the diameter of the optical fiber, allowing a range of clearance above and below the optical fiber (column 12, lines 16-21 and Figures); the width of the groove is larger than the diameter of the optical fiber, allowing a range of clearance on at least a side of the

Art Unit: 1725

optical fiber (column 12, lines 16-21 and Figures); the body is formed as a geometric solid with at least one substantially flat face; and the geometric solid is selected from a group consisting of a rectangular box, a cubical box, a cylinder, a semi-cylinder, a semi-sphere, a pyramid, and a cone (column 12, lines 16-21 and Figures); the body is formed from a metallic material "solder" (column 12, lines 16-21 and Figures); where the groove is larger than 125 micron (col. 5, ll. 13-15), where the groove has a height in the claimed range (figure 8, item 70).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boisgontier as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Enochs (4,702,547). Boisgontier teaches all of the limitations of the claims except that the body is formed from a glass material. Enochs teaches the body is formed from a glass "silicon" material (Summary of Invention and column 4, line 56-column 5, line 30). The gold layer formed on the surface of the silicon retaining member constitutes the solder of claim 1. It is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the solder could have been adhered to either the pad or the retaining member since both surfaces are relative to each other. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the silicon member of Enochs with the solder member of

Art Unit: 1725

Boisgontier in order to form a retaining member the maintains its shape during the soldering process.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 8 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., where the groove height is the distance between the bottom surface and the opening of the solder preform, where the opening runs along the surface of the solder preform) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant argues the definitions of width and height used by the examiner are improper. The examiner disagrees. During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given the broadest reasonable interpretation." Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969). In the instant case, dictionary.com defines

Art Unit: 1725

width as being the "extent from side to side." In applying the Prater test by giving the claims its broadest reasonable interpretation, it is the examiner's position that the Boisgontier teaches a width the distance between the bottom surface and the opening of the solder preform, which would be the measurement from one side to another side.

With respect to the "height" claim limitation, dictionary.com defines height as the "distance from the base of something to the top." In applying the Prater test by giving the claims its broadest reasonable interpretation, it is the examiner's position that the Boisgontier teaches a height as the overall height can be measured from the distance from the base of something to the top. The groove height would be the distance between the base (which corresponds to applicant's groove side) to the top (which corresponds to applicant's opposite groove side).

Applicant next argues the use of an explicit definition. The examiner, however, can find no statement in the specification where applicant uses an explicit or special definition of the terms.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan Johnson whose telephone number is 571-272-1177. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30 AM-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Pat Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1725

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Jonathan Johnson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1725

jj